



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,725	06/07/2000	Shusaku Uchibori	F-10190	8888
21254	7590	04/20/2006	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			TO, JENNIFER N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/588,725	UCHIBORI, SHUSAKU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer N. To	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-9, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lacks antecedent basis:

- i. said first task identifier – claim 4;

- b. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. as per claim 1, line 2, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "storing one or more event identifiers for an event of a plurality of events" (i.e. each event could have more than one identifiers).

- ii. as per claim 14, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "processing a second task with said first task resource, if a second event identifier, stored in said event storing unit, is the same as said first events identifier" (i.e. according to line 3, the first event identifier is deleted, then how to determine whether the second event identifier is the same with the first event identifier, based on what).

iii. as per claim 15, line 2, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "writing a second task resource" (i.e. how?).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iizuka et al. (hereafter Iizuka) (U.S. Patent No. 5251317).

6. As per claims 1, Iizuka teaches the invention as claim including a task system comprising:

a storage for storing one or more event identifiers for an event of a plurality of events (fig. 1, item 15; col. 3, lines 31-37; col. 4, lines 51-59);
a task control device for creating a task based on said event (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-18; col. 3, lines 47-58); and
a task processing device for executing a plurality of tasks (col. 2, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 1-6, 38-46, 59-64),

whereupon completing a first task of said plurality of tasks, said task processing device initiates a search for another event identifier, and if said another event identifier is the same as said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task, then

processes a second task, which has event identifier that is the same as said first task, using a resource used by said first task (figs. 8A-B; col. 5, lines 28-35).

7. As per claim 2, Iizuka teaches that wherein a first resource used by said first task, which is completed, is released from said task processing device toward said storage, when said another event identifier is not the same as said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task (col. 4, lines 32-50).

8. As per claim 3, Iizuka teaches that wherein said first resource is released from said storage, when said first resource is transferred from said storage via said task control device to said task processing device (col. 4, lines 51-65).

9. As per claim 4, Iizuka teaches that wherein:
said storage stores said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task identifier, which is executed by said task processing device (col. 3, lines 31-37; col. 5, lines 28-35), and
said task control device executes a search for said one or more vent identifiers corresponding to said first task in order to create said second task, which is the same as said first task, and executes said second task after completing said first task (col. 4, lines 51-68; col. 5, lines 1-35).

10. As per claim 5, Iizuka teaches that whereupon completing said first task, said processing device deletes one of said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task from said storage (col. 4, lines 51-65).

11. As per claim 6, Iizuka teaches that wherein said storage includes a task resource storing unit (fig. 1).

12. As per claim 7, Iizuka teaches that wherein said task control device includes an event checker that identifies said one or more event identifiers for each task of said plurality of tasks (figs 1-8).

13. As per claim 8, Iizuka teaches that wherein said task control device includes a task creator that creates a task corresponding to one of said one or more event identifiers (figs. 1-8; col. 3, lines 12-18).

14. As per claim 9, Iizuka teaches that wherein said task control device includes a task resource manager that transfers a task resource, corresponding to said one of said one or more event identifiers, to said task processing unit (col. 2, lines 21-26).

15. As per claims 10-13, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, and 5-9 above.

16. As per claim 14, Iizuka teaches the invention as claim including a method of processing a task, comprising:

processing a first task with a first task resource (col. 4, lines 9-50);
deleting a first event identifier, corresponding to said first task from an event storing unit, upon completion of said processing (col. 4, lines 51-65); and
processing a second task with said first task resource, if a second event identifier, stored in said event storing unit, is the same as said first event identifier (col. 4, lines 66-68; col. 5, lines 1-35).

17. As per claim 15, Iizuka further teaches writing a second task resource into a processing unit, if said second event identifier is not the same as said first event identifier (col. 4, lines 9-31).

18. As per claim 16, Iizuka further teaches initially storing a first event and said first event identifier in said event-storing unit (col. 4, lines 9-31; col. 5, lines 28-35); and creating said first task corresponding to said first event (col. 3, lines 11-18).

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 01/31/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Iizuka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5251317).

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lomelino et al. (U.S. Patent no. 5867675) teaches a system for maintaining a data stream between devices that handle data differently.

Mesa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6512591) teaches resources monitoring.

Hartung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4636946) teaches task processing system.

Kametani (U.S. Patent No. 5361369) teaches a method for allowing a processor to process a next task before synchronization between a predetermined groups of processors.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer N. To whose telephone number is (571) 272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer N. To
Examiner
Art Unit 2195



SUPERVISOR EXAMINER
T 2195 8/12/00